

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DAT	TE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/924,497	08/09/200	1	Takashi Saga	UDK-001	UDK-001 2619		
23353	7590 04/	07/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER		
RADER FIS	SHMAN & GRA	AUER PLLC		ALVAREZ	ALVAREZ, RAQUEL		
1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	ON, DC 20036			3622			

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summan	09/924,497	SAGA ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Raquel Alvarez	3622					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	I. lely filed the mailing date of this co (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 Ja	nuary 2006						
	action is non-final.						
,—	,—						
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,4,7 and 9-11</u> is/are pending in the	application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,4,7 and 9-11</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori	• •		Stage				
application from the International Bureau	- -		- 1-1-9-1				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	• • • •	d.					
Attachment(s)							
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa		D-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		· · ,				

Application/Control Number: 09/924,497 Page 2

Art Unit: 3622

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to communication filed on 1/31/2006.

2. Claims 1-2, 4, 7, 9-11 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 4, 7 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldhaber et al. (5,855,008 hereinafter Goldhaber).

With reference to claims 1-2, 4, 7 and 9-10 Goldhaber teaches a presentation method for providing advertisement information stored in a server to an exhibit via a network (Abstract). Requesting access to information stored in the server over the network (col. 9, lines 33-61 and col. 10, lines 9-38); selecting advertisement information among information stored in the server when access is authorized (col. 9, lines 33-61 and col. 10, lines 9-38); sending selected advertisement information from the server to the exhibitor over the network (col. 9, lines 33-67); wherein the selected advertisement information is a questionnaire is communicated over the network from the audience to the server (col. 16, lines 16-23); wherein personal information of the audience is registered and the personal information associated with the response is transferred to the server (col. 16, lines 49 to col. 18, lines 1-35).

Art Unit: 3622

Goldhaber does not expressly show that the advertisement information sent to the exhibitor is transmitted to a movie theater and shown to the audience before or after a feature presentation as a digital motion picture projected from a movie projector.

However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The advertisement information sent to the exhibitor is transmitted to a movie theater and shown to the audience before or after a feature presentation as a digital motion picture projected from a movie projector. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the advertisement information sent to the exhibitor is transmitted to a movie theater and shown to the audience before or after a feature presentation as a digital motion picture projected from a movie projector because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant argues that "advertisement information" is functionally involved in the recited steps. The Examiner wants to point that the non-functional material is not the "advertisement information" but the use of a "movie theater for presentation of a picture

Application/Control Number: 09/924,497 Page 4

Art Unit: 3622

projected from a movie projector" being used for transmission and showing of the movie. The Examiner wants to point out that the "transmitted" and "shown" steps would be performed the same regardless if is shown in a movie projector or not.

5. With respect to Applicant's argument that Goldhaber does not disclose that the advertisement information sent to the exhibitor is transmitted to a movie theater and shown to the audience before or after, since the particular data as recited has been determined to be nonfunctional descriptive material, it does not need to be taught by the prior art. Nonfunctional descriptive material cannot render nonobvious an invention that would have otherwise been obvious. *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (when descriptive material is not functionally related to the substrate, the descriptive material will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Point of contact

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raquel Alvarez whose telephone number is (571)272-6715. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric w. Stamber can be reached on (571)272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Raquel Alvarez
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3622

R.A. 4/5/2006